



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BRIEF MENTION.

Professor EARLE has displayed in his edition of the *Medea* (American Book Company) the same nice knowledge of Greek idiom and the same faculty of neat statement that made his *Oedipus* something out of the common run of college text-books and brought it within the range of the Journal (A. J. P. XXII 227). This nice knowledge of Greek has bred in him, as it is wont to do, fastidiousness as to the tradition, and for some years Professor EARLE has occupied an almost solitary eminence among American Hellenists as a conjectural critic; and so we find that in his edition of the *Medea*, he has incorporated into the text a considerable number of conjectures of his own. These alone would attract the attention of Professor EARLE's 'peers' to whom he appeals in his preface. The trouble about such an appeal is the constitution of the jury and the right of unlimited challenge that resides in the appellant. The other characteristic of Professor EARLE's book—the diligent pursuit of the phenomena of diction and syntax—will commend his notes to those who are studying Greek by themselves and need the guidance of an experienced teacher. The ordinary drill-master, on the other hand, will be somewhat resentful of the magisterial way, in which Professor EARLE has anticipated the usual questions of the classroom. Nor will the references to the current grammars satisfy the partisans of those manuals and I, for one, am sorry to see so pretty a book disfigured by strings of letters which have been inserted in obedience to commercial exigencies, and, I fear, all in vain. If all the grammars are not cited, then the questions will arise: Who maketh G to differ? Who maketh HA to differ? Why cite GS when G or HA will suffice? Why make any note at all, when such and such a grammar is at hand? My own example as a text-book maker has not been such a shining success that I can venture to give advice, but in the only Greek authors that I have edited, I have deliberately cut loose from all references, and have taken the ground that if a thing is worthy of notice, it is worthy of succinct statement. If there are to be references, let them be made, as they are in some editions, to a grammatical synopsis in the book itself.

In running over the notes, I have noticed some little *ludi magister* matters, in which it seems to me that Professor EARLE's persistency in making points, his didacticism, so to speak, has

been a snare to him. So, for instance, 'v. 33: ἀτιμάσας ἔχει = ἡτίμακε. This analytical perfect is noticeably common in Sophocles. In such a verb as ἵστημι, it is the only possible form for the transitive perf. act.' Here we have either too much or too little. Why Sophokles and not Aischylos, who according to Dindorf has but one example? If ἵστημι is to be mentioned, why not the lack of perfect forms elsewhere? Why not cite v. 90 as an example of the indispensableness of the analytical perfect? But when we come to v. 90, we are told oracularly that 'ἐρημώσας ἔχε is more than ἡρήμωκε', as if the 2 p. perf. imper. act. had anything but a death-in-life existence in the paradigms. V. 65, σέθεν for σου 'is one of the archaisms affected by Euripides. Incidentally it serves admirably to fill out the line'. Mommsen's remark on σέθεν is worth recording but the latter part of the note implies that this is a metrical trick of Euripides, and if this half-sneer at the poet is justified, we should expect a similar note on πρὸς = ὑπό, an equation which Professor EARLE makes repeatedly in his commentary. πρὸς is commended metrically quite as much as σέθεν. It avoids hiatus before ὑπ'. It avoids the lilt of ὑπό, the same lilt that has banished ἀποθανεῖν from tragedy in favour of κατθανεῖν. V. 95, 'μὴ φίλους is, strictly speaking, redundant after ἐχθρούς'. The negative statement is not a redundancy but a reinforcement. See Professor EARLE's own note on v. 36, repeated v. 276. V. 310: ὅπως ἦγεν: 'according to the promptings of your heart'. 'The imperfect in ἦγεν marks the persistence of the emotion that led to the action described in the aorist ἐξέδου', just as ἔως with the aorist is regularly preceded by the imperfect. But in the present form, the note seems to me utterly otiose. Professor EARLE's translation suggests the lesson, ἦγεν 'promptings', ἦγαγεν 'prompting', the imperfect representing the plural. Three barleycorns make one inch, three stars, say the rabbis, make one night, three aorists make one imperfect. And then there is the *pluralis maiestatis*, ἐκέλευεν, 'gave orders', not 'order'. The imperfect ἦγε is often used, where some critics write ἦγαγεν quite unnecessarily. So ἄγεν where some people expect ἀγαγεῖν. V. 316, 'In these two verses, we have a variant of the familiar contrast overworked by Thucydides, though a commonplace of Greek style, between λόγος "fiction" and ἔργον "fact"'. Of course, the polarity of 'word' and 'deed' is as old as 'word' and 'deed', and it is not necessary to cite Kemmer (A. J. P. XXIV 361) to prove it. But the polarity of λόγος, practically a post-Homeric word, and ἔργον belongs to the rationalistic movement of the fifth century and if Thucydides overworked it, he overworked a comparatively new toy, as some people overwork Greek syntax. He overworked it as he overworked the articular infinitive, as he overworked the substantivized adjective and participle, and Professor EARLE's note on Med. 178: τό γ' ἐμὸν πρόθυμον, quickens my regret that I did not select better examples (S. C. G. p. 16) to show the affinity of Thucydides and Euripides in this regard. Much more striking than Med. 178 are Hec. 299: τῷ θυμονμένῳ,

Hipp. 248: τὸ μαινόμενον and I. A. 1270: τὸ κείνου βουλόμενον. V. 474: It is hardly correct to say that λυπήσῃ is the Attic form for both continuative (imperfect) and aorist future passive. 'Cobet's authority has been shaken by the testimony of the stones', as Mr. Wyse points out in his *Isaeus*, p. 207. V. 597: ἔρυμα δώμασιν: 'with the same cadence as in *Bacch.* 55: ἀλλ' ὃ λιποῦσαι Τμῶλον, ἔρυμα Λυδίας. The dative of interest in this passage might have been a genitive'. But the two passages are typically different. ἔρυμα Λυδίας, is a mere definition. ἔρυμα δώμασιν shows a present practical interest. A pretty example of the shift is Andokid. 1, 117: ἦν θεῖός μοι, ἀδελφὸς τῆς μητρὸς τῆς ἐμῆς. V. 718: τοιάδ' οἶδα φάρμακα: 'this form of expression, native to English as to Greek, is logically a reversal of the order of cause and effect. Logical would be τοιάδε δ' οἶδα φάρμακα ὥστε πᾶνσω σ' ὄντ' ἀπαιδα'. A remark of this sort is positively hurtful, unless it is accompanied by the statement that the 'logical' form of expression is a stranger to Greek, so far as we know, down to a comparatively late time. The absence of the consecutive construction is one of the most striking features of Homeric syntax and the conception is not to be thrust into poetry.

But Professor EARLE will say: Relinque aliquantum orationis cras quod mecum litiges, and I turn to the feature of his edition first mentioned—his conjectures,—though all that I have to say of them is that they recall to my mind, by way of contrast, the brief note of WEIL in his new edition of the *Hippolytus*. 'Ces changements', he says, in recording the variations from his previous texts, 'ces changements—sont pour la plupart des retours au texte des manuscrits'. Perhaps when Professor EARLE reaches the age of the great Hellenist, whom we both admire, the *n*th edition of the *Medea* may contain a similar remark. The fact is that though I was trained by scholars who were far from averse to conjectural criticism, the hosts of extemporaneous restorations, or, as a good friend of mine would call them, 'autoschediastic repristinations', such as are poured forth by the veteran Blaydes and other scholars, have bewildered me so that I have settled down glumly to making the best of tradition; and I feel sorry for the future editor of the *Odyssey*, who will doubtless regard it his duty to register all the corrections that Mr. AGAR has set forth in the latest number of the *Journal of Philology*. They take up no less than fifty pages out of 128; and I hope that I shall be forgiven for prizing above all this critical acumen and creative ingenuity the few pages Mr. CECIL BENDALL occupies with his notes on the pronunciation of Greek as deduced from Graeco-Indian Bilingual Coins, B. C. 180-20. But instead of making any further confession of my own weakness in regard to conjectural criticism, I yield the floor of *Brief Mention* for a space to Mr. KENYON, whose words on this subject will carry more weight than mine.

The earlier the MS, the better, is a critical canon that was rudely shaken by the discovery of ancient papyri (cf. A. J. P. VI 109, XIII 383), and Dr. Kenyon's paper on the *Evidence of Greek Papyri with regard to Textual Criticism*, read January 27, 1904, before the British Academy is thoroughly disillusioning. 'The earliest papyri', he says, 'in spite of their difference in character from their successors, do not materially affect our conclusion as to the authenticity of our generally received texts'. 'Some errors are shown to be of earlier origin even than our papyri; and where the papyri do help us, they so rarely (on the whole) confirm the conjectures which critics have proposed as to make us doubt the power of modern scholarship without their aid'. 'It cannot be denied that in general the papyri do not support the conjectures of modern scholars. When they do, the variations have been generally small; in no case, it may safely be said, has any sweeping change been justified by the papyri'. 'Of the two aids upon which textual criticism is wont to rely in dealing with a doubtful text, the acumen of the critic and the scientific handling of the documentary evidence, the former is shown to be of very limited value. The chances against successful divination are great; and even if a critic should chance to be right, it is hardly possible to demonstrate his success. Consequently the presumption will always be against any emendation (except the simpler corrections of a newly discovered text) until documentary evidence can be produced in its support. But when documentary evidence is producible, then critical scholarship has its proper function to decide between the alternatives offered and often to prefer the evidence of a single witness to that of a considerable number. But even here the papyri have weakened its resources'. 'The papyri have shown us decisively in some cases, and allow us to argue by analogy to others, that <the> family-divisions <of MSS> are of relatively late origin, and that the better MSS have no sort of monopoly of ancient and correct readings'. 'In future, the editor will have to be prepared to find the truth not unfrequently among the witnesses who are usually inferior, and to exercise a freer judgment in deciding between them'. These are sweeping sentences and must call forth, if they have not already called forth, very active gain-saying on the part of those who are endowed with a quickness of vision and a readiness of resource that are denied to the pedestrian members of the philological guild, the ἀπτήνες ἐφημέριοι τालαοὶ βροτοὶ on whom the Immortal Birds look down with undisguised contempt. And yet one is tempted to see in recent critical work some signs of the liberty regained, of which Dr. KENYON speaks, and wider eclecticism is beginning to make itself felt. At all events, Mr. Wyse's aphorism (Isaeus p. 336) will hardly apply to Mr. KENYON. 'The most tenacious upholders of MS authority are generally people who have not studied MSS'.

The fact that my own style has been pronounced 'bad' by the *Saturday Review* and 'unscholarly' by the *Spectator* has not in any way dampened my ardor in the study of the elements of literary composition. If the sentence is just, I am no worse off than the great majority of the guild to which I belong; and time brings with it many consolations. Gildersleeve's Pindar, said a superfine critic, nearly twenty years ago, 'is not a Pindaric book', but since the ancient date of that criticism, I have read some judgments on Pindar that might cause Mr. VERRALL to change his opinion. WILAMOWITZ says of Pindar 'Der adelsstolze Aegide schrickt nicht vor dem hässlichen zurück'. SCHROEDER remarks 'Geben wir uns doch keinen Illusionen hin. Gerade im Gebrauch der Metaphern ist Pindars Kunst noch roh und ungeläutert'. But the characteristic of all characteristics is the one that I owe to the kindness of a friend, who has sent me the following extract from J. HART'S *Geschichte der Weltliteratur* (I 247): In seinen Adern rollt das schwere Blut des Bööters und wie ein Mastodont stampft dieser Dichter durch die Haine der hellenischen Dichtung denn auch dahin, schwer und wuchtig'. So perhaps my book is a Pindaric book after all.

Since which things are so, undismayed I continue to study the old rusty canons of style and to treasure the *obiter dicta* of critics, far inferior to the one I am about to cite. In an essay written shortly before his lamented death KARL HILLEBRAND made an observation which left so deep an impression on my mind that I can hardly be wrong as to the substance of it, though I have not been able to verify the passage itself. Every cultivated Englishman, he wrote in effect, reads French, but how many can distinguish between French styles? How many can measure the distance that separates Prosper Mérimée and Octave Feuillet? Now this is a home-thrust at the mob of people who read French as they do English, but there are not so many, even of those born to the English tongue who could give any reasoned account of the difference between the most strongly contrasted English styles. And when it comes to comparing national styles, French style as a whole with English style as a whole, the most determined analyst might well give it up in despair. But we Americans are a very resolute set and in the preface to his translation of CROISSET'S *Abridged History of Greek Literature* (Macmillan), Professor HEFFELBOWER does not hesitate to give us the conclusion of the whole matter in a few pregnant words. 'The innate quality of dignified French style', he says, 'is brilliance; while that of even the most polished English style is majesty'. And, what is more, he has undertaken to live up to his canon. The brilliance of the CROISSETS is to be the majesty of HEFFELBOWER. Of course, my curiosity, as a student of style, was piqued by this confession of faith and profession of practice and I read eagerly

page after page, finding, to my intense disappointment that the English suggested everywhere a retranslation into French. If the experiment had been a success, this would have been impossible. In the first place the periodology seemed to be French throughout and the particles betrayed the translator; and I could not suppress the question: 'If these things are done in CROISSET, what would have been done in the Goncourts, who boasted that they were untranslatable?' But I am a timid soul and distrust impressionistic criticism. So I began to compare the HEFFELBOWER rendering with the original, and turned to the page devoted to Hipponax for closer study. Hipponax belongs to the tramp class, for which we all have a weakness in literature, and I thought that p. 110 would give a good opportunity to compare the brilliance of Paris with the majesty of Waukesha. The disillusionment was great. Everybody knows that Hipponax was a little, scrawny, misshapen fellow and ALFRED CROISSET says of him, 'Il était, dit-on, petit et contrefait'. The brilliance of this sentence, I confess, it is hard to discern, but still harder the majesty of HEFFELBOWER'S rendering—'Men said he was petty and counterfeit'.

Now this blunder is so preposterous that at first I doubted whether it could be matched in the 562 pp. of Professor HEFFELBOWER'S version. But I am genuinely sorry to say that it is not a solitary slip but only a majestic specimen. For I yield to no one in my admiration of the CROISSETS, and I had hoped that we should have a brief history of Greek literature that should be neither dry nor deliquescent nor frivolous (A. J. P. XXV 234), and if it cannot be had in English and cannot be illustrated by English literature, a good translation from such French masters as the CROISSETS would serve an excellent purpose. But my hopes are dashed. True, the translator in his Preface thanks the authors for the reading of the manuscript before it went to press. But we all know what that amounts to. The *Athenaeum* of Oct. 29 says that 'Mr. Heffebower has done his part of the work well'. But reviewers learn to distrust reviewers. The *Nation* of January 12 points out some sad mistakes in the translation of the specimens of Greek literature, the rare specimens selected by the Croisets for the illustration of the text, but the false translations and poor translations are not confined to these parts of the book. 'The translation is fluent enough', says the *Nation*, and so it is. And that is the worst of it, or to quote Rudyard Kipling, in 'The Old Men', 'and that is the hell of it'. I open the book at Chapter XV on Aristophanes. 'Enfant de génie' is rendered 'talented youth'. 'Enfant de génie' may be 'brilliant' and 'talented youth' 'majestic', and, though I have not forgotten Coleridge's disapproval of 'talented', I forbear. But what is this? 'Already

(*déjà, schon*) a moralist and a sharp critic of the new tendencies, he followed the fashion of the day in making his plays educational'. Now there is a strong didactic tendency in all Greek comedy as in all Greek literature, and though every Greek scholar knows that the *Δαιταλῆς* was a forerunner of the *Clouds* in its assaults on the education of the day, the sentence might pass. But what says M. MAURICE CROISSET, for it is Maurice and not Alfred that speaks this time—a fact we should never have learned from the translator? 'Déjà moraliste et critique acerbe des tendances nouvelles il y faisait le procès de l'éducation à la mode'. Even if Professor HEFFELBOWER had known less French than he seems to know, an elementary knowledge of Greek literature would have saved him here as it would have saved him in the passage about Hipponax. I turn to the section on Isokrates (p. 361) by ALFRED CROISSET. 'Isokrates', we are told, 'completed his education under Gorgias, then retired to Thessaly, and returned to Athens to practice the profession of a logographer'. The original shows that it was Gorgias who had retired to Thessaly and not Isokrates. 'Questions of inheritance, fraud, *injustice*, seemed paltry to him'. A question of injustice is never paltry, not even when it pertains to translations from the French. But the original has '*injures*', and everyone who has read Lysias catches the allusion to Lys. VIII κατηγορία πρὸς τοὺς συνουσιαστὰς κακολογιῶν. 'What has given <Isokrates> the considerable place he holds in the history of Greek prose is his *declamatory orations and his discourses of instruction*', gives us a false and misleading version of 'ses discours d'apparat et son enseignement'. But this is small game for a philological journal, and Professor HEFFELBOWER might have escaped *Brief Mention*, if it had not been for the daring generalization of his preface and the bold assertion of his own ideal. Doubtless he has learned much from close communion with such admirable scholars as the CROISSETS who are singular in their ability to translate grammatical and linguistic phenomena into literary characteristic, just as Mrs. CUST (A. J. P. XXI 476) must have learned a great deal about semantics from her rendering of BRÉAL's *Sémantique*, which, by the way, has reached its third edition, but it is little short of a crime for any one but an accomplished Greek scholar to meddle with such a work of art as CROISSET. The abridged CROISSET is 'not a work of erudition' says the author's preface, but it is based on erudition. To understand CROISSET one must know the subject at first hand. Gibbon was translated by Guizot, Karl Otfried Müller by Karl Hillebrand, and the CROISSETS deserved a better fate.

M. BRÉAL has warned us against personification (XVIII 368). Yet given *la langue* and *le langage*, who would not choose *la langue*? Language is a woman, a queen, a coquette, with all the audacities, all the pudencies of the sex; now outspoken,

now reticent; now *décolletée*, now *collet monté*; one thing in the street, another in the ball-room, yet another in the water. Every student of language notices these things. Language is perfectly capable of murdering a child and putting flowers on its grave. The English dative has been killed. Its inheritance has been given to the accusative and yet when it comes to turning the dead dative into a nominative along with the accusative there is a certain recalcitrancy, as English grammarians have noticed (A. J. P. XXIII 18). 'I was read a letter' hurts. Promote a drudge to be a noble (A. J. P. XXIII 11). Elevate the articular infinitive. Give it the *σεμνότης* of a verbal noun. But mark! it is a 'persönllicher Adel' such as is bestowed on professors in Germany. It has no plural. It must after all make its obeisance to the verbal noun. French has no scruples—*les devoirs, les pouvoirs*. Of course, there is no way of making a plural to the infinitive in Greek or in Latin, but the language ought to have thought of that before. These limitations in the use of the infinitive are very interesting as showing a subconsciousness of language, or of the users of language, if you choose. In my note on Persius 1, 9: *nostrum id vivere triste* I said, 'This is a so-called *figura Graeca* which out-Greeks the Greeks. *Scire tuum* v. 27; *ridere meum* v. 122; *velle suum* 5, 53; *sapere nostrum* 6, 38 cannot be rendered literally into the language from which they are supposed to be imitated'. This was in 1875 before anybody paid any attention to American work in grammar and the challenge was not noticed. I came back to the subject in my article on the articular infinitive (*Transactions Am. Phil. Ass.* 1878, p. 3): In classic Greek there is no parallel for certain Latin constructions, such as are usually set down as Hellenisms. In such Greek as that of Ignatius we are not surprised to find, Ep. ad Eph. 3: τὸ ἀδιάκριτον ἡμῶν ζῆν 11: τὸ ἀλήθινον ζῆν, ad Magn. 1: τοῦ διὰ παντὸς ἡμῶν ζῆν; 5: τὸ ζῆν αὐτοῦ, all vulgarisms or Latinisms. But the traditional view persists, and in an elaborate article on the Latin substantivized infinitive (cf. A. J. P. VIII 103) Wölfflin speaks of Greek influence, as does Brenous (A. J. P. XVII 520). In an Upsala dissertation of 1893 Nordenstam, who has made use of my work, brushes my remark aside and cites passages from Plotinus, as if Plotinus counted among the classic Greek authors. And even Plotinus has not the hardihood to put the possessive genitive between the article and the infinitive except once, as Nordenstam himself notes. Now it seems to me passing strange that there should not be a solitary survival of τὸ ἡμέτερον ζῆν in the whole range of classical Greek literature and that the only way in which it has come down to us is through the Latin reproduction of it. In his notes on Schepers' edition of Alkiphron, Rh. M. LVIII 454, Bücheler postulates the Greek construction, writes I 9, 3: ἐπὶ τῷ σφετέρῳ κερδαίνειν, translates Plautus's, *tuom amare* (Curc. 28) τὸ σὸν ἐρᾶν and makes merry over the commentators of fifty years syne, who would not accept the reading of the MSS in X. Anab. VII 7. 24 ἄλλων τὸ ἥδη κολάζειν—an impossible con-

struction, said the old duffers, who cited the other old duffers, Matthiä and Rost. But Matthiä had read more Greek than most Greek grammarians and Rost was a man of excellent sense and while Krüger has shown conclusively (§ 47 10, 2) that the articular infinitive can take the genitive, every example cited by him has the genitive outside of the complex and the example that he adduces from Herodotos IX 58, 2: Ἀρταβάζου δὲ θῶμα καὶ μᾶλλον ἐποιέμεν τὸ καὶ καταρρωδῆσαι Λακεδαιμονίους, is not a possessive genitive unless we choose to call *θανμάζω τί τις* an instance of a possessive genitive. It is not the possessive genitive, strictly speaking. Kühner-Gerth (II 2, 37) calls it the subjective genitive but the possessive genitive may be subjective as well; and nearly all the examples are clearly partitive as is the genitive with parts of the body and if the personification we call language is too dainty to put the genitive between the article and the infinitive, it was too dainty to combine the possessive pronoun with the articular infinitive. In the absence of further evidence, then, *nostrum vivere* is vulgar Latin or at most pseudo-Greek, like some of the French phrases that have to be interpreted to a Frenchman.

G. L. H.: In his edition of *du Bellay's La Deffence et illustration de la langue francoyse* (Paris, Fontemoing, 1904) M. HENRI CHAMARD has given us a fitting complement to his very meritorious doctorate thesis upon the author, published in 1900. It is bound to be cited as the standard edition, as it gives an exact reproduction of the original edition of 1549 without the inaccuracies found in Person's edition, hitherto considered the best. The student of the French language owes the editor a debt of gratitude for the variants of all the editions of the sixteenth century, which are to be found in the critical apparatus. In the notes the editor has been the first to point out the sources of a number of passages in the treatise, and the illustrative citations from contemporary writers show a wide acquaintance with the literature of the period. Further, the notes upon points of philological matter have a merit, found in very few editions of French works of the sixteenth century.

Professor HERBERT A. STRONG, Liverpool University, is engaged in translating Müller and Deecke's *Etrusker*. The latest discovered inscriptions in the Etruscan language will be given.